International Journal of Group Psychotherapy

ISSN: 0020-7284 (Print) 1943-2836 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ujgp20

The Laboratory Training Model: Rationale, Method, and Some Thoughts for the Future

Bernard Lubin & William B. Eddy

To cite this article: Bernard Lubin & William B. Eddy (1970) The Laboratory Training Model: Rationale, Method, and Some Thoughts for the Future, International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 20:3, 305-339, DOI: 10.1080/00207284.1970.11491768

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/00207284.1970.11491768

Published online: 29 Oct 2015.

Submit your article to this journal

View related articles

Citing articles: 2 View citing articles

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=ujgp20

The Laboratory Training Model: Rationale, Method, and Some Thoughts for the Future

BERNARD LUBIN, PH.D., and
WILLIAM B. EDDY, PH.D.

THE LABORATORY TRAINING METHOD, as Bunker notes, ". . . had its beginnings in the wedding of social action and scientific inquiry" (1965, p. 131). Since its inception in 1947, laboratory training has exerted an important influence on developments within a number of fields, including education, industry, religion, community development, and volunteer and professional agencies.

The definition of laboratory training as an educational method, which gathered momentum from its roots in the field of research and theory in social psychology, can be traced from its inception (Benne, 1964; Bradford, 1967). Within the past few years, however, the definition has become less clear as a result of the tendency by the public and some professionals to use interchangeably such terms as laboratory training groups, sensitivity training groups, T-groups, encounter groups, therapy groups, etc. Part of the confusion arises from the development in recent years of a large number of experimental groups and part from recent developments in the laboratory training method itself.

Dr. Lubin is Professor and Associate Director of Training, Department of Psychiatry, University of Missouri School of Medicine at Kansas City.

Dr. Eddy is Professor, School of Administration, University of Missouri at Kansas City.

The authors wish to thank Leland P. Bradford, Jerry B. Harvey, Alice W. Lubin, Kurt Olmosk, David Peters, Oron South, Duane Thomas, and F. Lee Van Horn for their assistance.

The laboratory training model refers to a range of experience-based learning activities in which participants are centrally involved in goal setting, observing, feeding back, analyzing data, planning action or change steps, evaluating, etc. Data which are within the learning situation itself provide the material for learning. The format may take a number of forms; the best known form, the "laboratory," has the character of a conference. It is the form that will be discussed in this paper.

The laboratory consists of ". . . different groupings of participants with differing technologies of training in the service of various learning objectives. Staff members are in continuous communication in order to establish and maintain relationships among the parts of the laboratory experience. As the laboratory proceeds in time, participants are brought together in integrating sessions designed to help them relate the parts of their overall laboratory experience. Integration of learnings becomes a central concern for participants in work on problems of application of laboratory learnings in their home situations" (Benne, 1964, pp. 108-109).

"Laboratory" has been used on occasion as a synonym for T-group, and vice versa. The T-group is an important component of the laboratory and is crucial for certain types of learnings. It is one of the "groupings" referred to by Benne above, but using the term as a synonym for the overall laboratory contributes to the confusion of terms.

This paper attempts, where possible, to differentiate laboratory training from therapy groups and encounter groups. An historical overview, information on rationale and method, and some thoughts for the future are presented.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The intellectual climate of the third and fourth decades of the twentieth century was optimistic, pragmatic, and oriented toward exploring the use of social-psychological knowledge and methods in the solution of social problems. This was the period when John Dewey made his contributions. Also, during this period, the social-emotional components of the educational process were recognized.

The workshop method of teaching and learning began in the summer of 1936 at Ohio State University (Diederich and Van Til, 1945) and was quickly recognized as an educational vehicle that accelerated the produc-

tivity of participants as they worked on solutions to practical problems. At about this same time (1938), Ronald Lippit and Ralph White, under the direction of Kurt Lewin, conducted their well-known studies on autocratic, laissez-faire, and democratic leadership. Kurt Lewin, during this period, was experimenting with the potential of the small group for changing attitudes and behavior. He developed field theory and was engaged in various action-research projects. For several years during this period, Leland P. Bradford was exploring and developing improved methods for use in adult education. While in the same period, at Teachers College, Columbia University, Kenneth D. Benne had become convinced ". . . that the social-psychological processes of building a community out of conflicting orientations were a part of the basis for building informed and authoritative decisions leading to effective action" (Bradford, 1967, p. 129).

In the relationship that developed between these men over the next half a decade was the basis for collaboration in the summer of 1946. During the summer of 1946 the Connecticut Interracial Commission, the Connecticut Department of Education, and the Research Center for Group Dynamics (then at M.I.T.) jointly sponsored a training-research workshop at the State Teachers College in New Britain, Connecticut. The purpose of the workshop was to develop more effective local leaders to assure the success of the Fair Employment Practices Act. The Research Center for Group Dynamics was to conduct research on the effects of workshop experience and the later application of learnings.

Participants invited to the workshop were mainly from teaching and social work backgrounds. Kenneth D. Benne, then at Columbia University, Leland P. Bradford of the National Education Association, and Ronald Lippitt of the Research Center for Group Dynamics (R.C.G.D.) comprised the training staff; Kurt Lewin, R.C.G.D., Ronald Lippitt, and three graduate students in social psychology who served as research observers (Morton Deutsch, Murray Horwitz, and Melvin Seeman) were the research staff.

The design of the workshop initially consisted of three ten-member groups discussing back-home problems. Role-playing was used for diagnostic clarification and for practice of potential solutions. Using pretested schedules, a research observer in each group coded interactions

and behavioral sequences for the purpose of reporting in the evening meeting to the training staff—*not* to the small groups.

A few participants who requested permission to attend the evening staff meeting were allowed to do so. Their obvious interest in, and involvement with, the observer's feedback of the interactional data attracted other participants. Soon all participants were attending the evening staff meetings and reporting that they were much more interested in the interactional data than in the substantive discussions around which the observations were made and that these observations were helping them to understand their own behavior and the development of their groups.

In 1947, with the direct sponsorship of the National Education Association and the Research Center for Group Dynamics of M.I.T., the above-named training staff organized a three-week summer session at Gould Academy in Bethel, Maine.[1] An isolated "cultural island" location was selected because of Lewin's conviction that change was more likely if the usual situational forces which acted to resist change could be left behind.

The Basic Skills Training Group (BST) was included in this three-week summer session. It contained an observer who fed back behavioral data for the group discussion. A staff member referred to as the training leader assisted the group to evaluate the observations made by the observer, as well as data supplied by the participants in the group.

Benne (1964) summarizes the expectations that the staff held for the BST groups:

> In the first place, one of its functions was to help members internalize some more or less systematic sets of concepts. One was a schema of deliberate or planned change and the skills required by the agent of such change. Another set had to do with indices and criteria of group development which in turn presupposed knowledge of and sensitivity to a rather complex set of group variables.
>
> A second expectation was that the group would provide practice

[1] Bethel, Maine is synonymous with laboratory training for many people because it began there and for a number of years it was the only site where it took place. Over the past ten years, however, the number of sites at which laboratory training is conducted has continued to increase. The 1970-71 NTL Institute announcement lists laboratories of various kinds conducted in more than fifty locations throughout the United States, Canada, Mexico, Great Britain, and Europe.

in diagnostic action skills of the change agent and of the group member and leader. Skill practice, through role playing, thus played a fairly heavy part in the methodology of BST Groups in 1947 and 1948.

A third expectation was that the behavioral content would run the gamut of "human organization" from the interpersonal level and the group level to the intergroup level (both in formal organizations and in "communities"). There resulted a competition between discussing here-and-now happenings which of necessity focused on the personal, interpersonal, and group levels, and discussing outside case materials. This sometimes resulted in the rejection of any serious consideration of the observer's report of behavioral data. More often, it led eventually to rejection of outside problems as less involving and fascinating.

A fourth expectation was that the BST Group would help its members to plan the application of laboratory learnings to back-home situations and to plan for continuing growth for themselves and their associates. A fifth expectation was that members would gain a more objective and accurate view of themselves in their relations to other persons in the group and to the developing group as a whole.

A sixth expectation was that participants would develop a clearer understanding of democratic values. These values were to be operationalized in terms of principles of methodology for functioning as a leader or member of a group and as an initiator and facilitator of change.

A seventh expectation was that members of the BST Group would not only acquire skills and understandings to help them function more adequately as change agents and as group members but that they would also acquire trainer skills and understandings required for communicating these to others [pp. 85-87].

Although this set of expectations was soon seen as overly ambitious and unrealistic for accomplishment in one session, the experience was to generate more than twenty years of experimentation with objectives, groupings, technologies, and client systems.

The BST Group evolved into the T-group. "Two Periods in T-group Evolution" are delineated by Benne (1964):

The first period, roughly from 1949 through 1955, is marked by a variety of experimental attempts to create training formats and technologies to serve learning objectives seen as extraneous to those peculiarly within the province of the T-group [training group]. This led at times to virtual segregation of T-group activities. Separate group-

> ings were formed for skill practice, for application of laboratory learnings, and for the study of change, among other activities. Sometimes, separate staff units for handling T-group activities and non-T-group activities were recruited. This experimentation was greatly aided by two large grants from the Carnegie Corporation of New York for the development of NTL's program.
>
> The second period, roughly from 1956 to the present, is marked by efforts to reintegrate T-group experiences into the designs of laboratories. Experimentation with new designs and with new uses of T-groups continues [pp. 87-88].

Bradford's comments (1967)[2, 3] tie together the historical developments of laboratory training and the organizational development of the NTL Institute:

> [The first period (1949 through 1955)] . . . saw a variety of efforts to solve the problems of multiple learnings. Community case studies, skill clinics, large-meeting experimentation, conference planning, massive total-laboratory role playing for a week at a time of a complicated community problem were all experimentations in the more difficult task of training change agents to work in large and complicated social systems.
>
> In recent years, separate programs in community leadership, conflict management, and consultation skills have been directed toward this problem.
>
> During the 1950's three trends came into being. Regional Laboratories emerged autonomously: the Western Training Laboratory, the Pacific Northwest Laboratory, the Intermountain Laboratory for Group Development, and the Boston University Summer Laboratory. Some have now merged or collaborated with NTL as a national program has steadily grown.
>
> The second trend was the development of occupational laboratory sessions held during the year—most notably in the fields of industry and religion. . . .
>
> Another trend, beginning in the late 1950's, has been that NTL and Network members have been engaged increasingly as change agents in organizational growth and development . . . .

[2] The history of laboratory training in the United States is predominantly the history of the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science. We have drawn to a large extent from published material by the NTL Institute and its faculty who are based at various universities.

[3] Leland P. Bradford has been Executive Director of the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science since its inception in 1947.

> The 1960's have seen the extension of NTL activities into many new social and occupational areas leading toward the establishment of the five Centers: (1) Center for Organization Studies; (2) Center for the Development of Educational Leadership; (3) Center for Community Affairs; 4) Center for the Development of Leadership in Government; and (5) Center for International Training.[4] All of these are part of the new NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science [pp. 141-142].

Regional development continues. The Midwest Group for Human Resources based in Kansas City, Missouri, is now the Midwest Division of the NTL Institute, and metropolitan offices have been opened in Chicago, Illinois, and Portland, Oregon, with movement toward development of regional centers in Northern California, San Diego, California, New York City, and Atlanta, Georgia.

Over the past fifteen years a number of people from Europe and Great Britain have participated in various NTL laboratories and trainer development programs and have developed laboratory training activities on their return home. NTL maintains a close relationship with the European Institute for Transnational Studies in Group and Organizational Behavior, many of whose members have served on the staff of NTL laboratories. For a number of years, staff members of the Tavistock Institute and other educational and training facilities throughout the world have served as staff members of NTL Institute programs, thereby facilitating considerable interchange of ideas and technologies.

Regional development has facilitated creativity in programming by providing opportunity for experimentation and field testing of new designs. The Midwest Group for Human Resources-NTL, in its Midwest Executive Development Laboratory, has developed a unique, experience-based learning situation for managers which devotes a substantial portion of the second week to the issue of human problems involved in merging organizations (Eddy et al., 1968).

The Western Training Laboratory has produced the philosophical underpinning for what is now called the "Laboratory with a Personal-Interpersonal Emphasis." The "Self in Process" model of training (Weschler et al., 1962) was developed by three members of the NTL

[4] During the past year, two new Centers have been opened, the Center for a Voluntary Society and the Black Affairs Center.

Network on the faculty of the Graduate School of Business Administration, UCLA: Irving R. Weschler, Fred Massarik, and Robert Tannenbaum. The model was instrumental in branching some training activities away from the group process model.

Following are the authors' statements of rationale and desired learning outcomes for their method:

> The network of social relationships which vitally influences our lives is replete with contradictory demands and inconsistencies. These not only take their toll of the clinically recognized psychotic, but they also affect the lives of most of us who seem to be getting along tolerably well with the world and the people around us.
>
> While the obviously ill often are pushed with irrevocable force toward seeking a solution for their acute discomfort, the rest of us relatively healthy individuals find ourselves in a dilemma. In most respects we seem adjusted in our day-by-day activities. We appear to behave appropriately with regard to the demands made upon us by our families, friends, and jobs. Yet this appearance is deceptive. Internal doubts and schisms persist. As no convenient learning vehicle is typically available to the 'pseudo-healthy' person, tensions below the surface debilitate realization of potential capacities, stunt creativity, infuse hostility into a vast range of human contact, and frequently generate hampering psychosomatic problems.
>
> Our recent approach to sensitivity training represents one means for facilitating the personal growth of persons who, while 'normal' by most accepted cultural standards, may indeed be affected in subtle and complex ways by these very standards. For us (and, no doubt, for many others), sensitivity training is no longer primarily a technique for the improvement of group functioning, the development of interpersonal skills, the intellectual discussion of human relations problems, or the more surface discussion of neurotic manifestations. (It should be noted that in the early 1950's the predecessor to our present UCLA program was called "Skill Practice in Supervision.") Rather, sensitivity training is now pointed in the direction of total enhancement of the individual.
>
> Our version of sensitivity training increasingly concerns itself with strengthening of the individual in his desires to experience people and events more fully, to know himself more intimately and accurately, to find a more significant meaning for his life, and to initiate or sustain a process of individual growth toward ever-increasing personal adequacy.
>
> We are beginning to deal with life values which come to be deeply

> reflected in the total pattern of a person's attitudes and behavior. We are involved, for instance, with his tendency to control or be controlled by others, with his management of anger, with his ability to express and receive love or affection, with his feelings of loneliness, with his search for personal identity, with his testing of his own adequacy, and with other similar concerns. Any one of these themes is typically of somewhat greater personal significance to one person than to another, yet each is likely to have real meaning to all, as they go through a training experience together.
>
> Consideration of these issues in training involves two concurrent processes—the group's activities may revolve around the exploration and personal experiencing of the meaning of these values, often without using the specific labels, while theory sessions may deal explicitly with these same issues. Thus, our present training methods touch on live values both in the language of feelings and behavior and by efforts to spell out underlying concepts in cognitive terms [pp. 34-35].

Although this approach de-emphasizes group-level learning, it is important to note that the authors, while championing the role of affect, retain an important status for the role of cognition and understanding.

During recent years NTL-Institute for Applied Behavioral Science has responded to the diversity of participant and staff interests, the broad range of emphases that seem to be technically feasible within the laboratory and T-group format, and the rich fund of skills, both within and outside the NTL network of trainers. In their public laboratories (sometimes called "stranger laboratories"), which are residential conferences of from one to two weeks in length offered throughout the year at various locations, NTL now offers labs at different levels and with considerable variation within each level.

The most recent NTL announcement lists types of Basic Human Interaction Laboratories, their design focus, their individual and organizational relevance, and the type of experiences that are likely to be included (see Table 1).

A number of additional basic training experiences of a specialized nature are listed, as well as eight different advanced laboratories and six professional development programs.

The trend toward greater differentiation of laboratories acknowledges the wide diversity in client needs and permits the development of more organic and concentrated laboratory designs.

TABLE 1

BASIC LABORATORIES IN HUMAN INTERACTION

Design Focus	Individual and Organizational Relevance	Experiences
Personal and Interpersonal	more openness and honesty in dealing with self and others/ reduced defensiveness and game-type behavior/increased ability to learn from one's own behavior/expanded awareness to growth potential/increased awareness of racially conditioned feelings and attitudes	T-Groups Nonverbal Painting Improvisation and fantasy Body movement Interpersonal confrontation Racial confrontation
	improved communication with others/development of new ways of working with others/locating feelings that block satisfactory and effective relationships, and bringing these out for examination/working for creative resolution to conflict	
Intergroup	effects on your behavior when your group is working with another group/looking at your loyalties in multigroup operations/diagnosing intragroup problems brought on by intergroup work/examining the effect of different racial mixtures	T-groups Competitive and collaborative exercises Observation of groups Conflict models Multiple loyalty simulations Construction of conceptual models
	examining intergroup consultation, cooperation, and competition (corresponds to interdepartmental relationships in a firm)/how changes can be made between groups/looking at payoffs for collaboration and competition/conceptualizing and confronting conflict, including that generated by racial differences	
Group	increasing ability to act in different ways in a group and to live with different types of group climate, including that in which race is a problem/getting feedback on your group style and work methods/using your own feelings to help understand group process/feeling freer in groups	T-groups Role analysis Cluster and large groups Team building Consultation Helping relationships Construction of conceptual models Group problem-solving exercises
	understanding stages of group life and development/leadership and membership in groups (such as departments, task forces, teams, classes)/learning why some problems get "solved" over and over, and why some decisions don't stick/constructive methods for dealing with problem members/experimenting with different methods for handling racially generated problems	

RATIONALE AND METHOD

Even a few years ago the practice of laboratory training outstripped the development of sound theory. Today the gap has widened considerably. The situation seems to us to be very much analogous to that of group psychotherapy. And similar to the situation in the field of group psychotherapy, there are a number of theories about the method of learning in laboratory training. Only bits and pieces of these theoretical structures, however, have received empirical test. (For statements of theory, the reader is referred to Bennis and Shepard [1956], Bradford et al. [1964], Schein and Bennis [1965], Mann [1967], Hampden-Turner [1966], and Argyris [1968].)

We have decided to present a few of the assumptions which guide the design and conduct of laboratories and some hypotheses about the process of attitudinal change. The assumptions are highly synoptic and contain within them meta-assumptions about the nature of the generalized client, his needs, and the potentiality of the laboratory situation to relate to these learning needs. They are intended to be illustrative, not necessarily representative.

1) Participants have been culturally conditioned to inhibit the expression of the emotional aspects of their communications, thus reducing interpersonal effectiveness.

The laboratory method legitimizes feelings and facilitates experiencing, expressing, and examining the emotional aspects of communication.

2) Participants, however well they may function interpersonally, have developed resistances against attending to certain classes of cues about the effect of their behavior on others. Thus, their potential for learning newer, more functional behaviors is inhibited.

The laboratory provides an opportunity for each participant to receive information about how his behavior is seen and to learn about his impact on others.

3) Even though participants might have opportunities in everyday life situations to receive such information as mentioned above, it is extremely difficult for them to feel free enough to practice new behavior because of the real or imagined high risk involved.

The laboratory sanctions, encourages, and provides opportunities for the practice and analysis of new behavior.

4) Although participants function more or less well in leadership and membership roles in a variety of groups back home, the press of substantive factors in their groups and other considerations make it unlikely that they have opportunities to examine important dimensions of the group at work (decision making, communication, problem solving, etc.) and their own performance in relation to these group dimensions.

The laboratory, especially those with a group or organizational focus, can and does provide opportunities, both structured and unstructured, to learn about the many forces at work in groups and to study one's own performance in relation to these forces.

5) Participants may have considerable cognitive knowledge about the "principles" of leadership, communication, group dynamics, etc. However, they may not be able, for a variety of reasons, to translate the knowledge into action.

The experience-based laboratory approach may help them to operationalize their knowledge.

Schein and Bennis (1965) have addressed themselves to the manner in which attitudinal change takes place in laboratory training. The model would seem to be heuristically useful and consonant with several theories.

> Essentially, the model specifies that attitude change consists of three stages or phases which correspond closely to what Lewin identified as the stages of change: (1) unfreezing, (2) changing, and (3) refreezing. The first two of these stages are necessary conditions of change, the third is concerned with the stability of whatever change occurs. Under each of these stages, we can identify certain key mechanisms, as follows:
>
> Stage 1. Unfreezing
>
> 1. Lack of confirmation or disconfirmation.
> 2. Induction of guilt-anxiety.
> 3. Creation of psychological safety by reduction of threat or removal of barriers to change.
>
> Stage 2. Changing
>
> 1. Scanning the interpersonal environment.
> 2. Identifying with a model.
>
> Stage 3. Refreezing
>
> 1. Personal—integrating new responses into the rest of the personality and attitude system.
> 2. Relational—integrating new responses into ongoing significant relationships.

> . . . attitude change begins with a dis-equilibrium, with some information about a person that leaves him uncomfortable because it is unexpected or violates his image of himself. Often such disconfirming information leaves him feeling anxious or guilty. In order for change to occur, however, some psychological safety must be present in the situation or else the person will simply become defensive and more rigid. Though this process sounds somewhat cognitive, we wish to emphasize the basically emotional features of becoming unfrozen.
>
> If the person comes to feel safe, he will begin to seek some new information about himself which will allow him cognitively to redefine some beliefs about himself or his relationships to others. Such new information will be obtained by one of two basic mechanisms: (1) scanning the available interpersonal environment for relevant cues, (2) identifying with some particular other person whose beliefs seem to be more viable.
>
> The changee, in other words, may begin to try to view himself from the perspective of another person or from the perspective of an array of others. As his perspective, his frame of reference, shifts, he develops new beliefs about himself which, in turn, lead to new feelings and behavioral responses.
>
> If these new feelings and responses fit well with the rest of the person's personality and attitudes and/or if they are confirmed or reinforced by others, a new cycle of unfreezing and changing is initiated until the person finds attitudes (feelings, beliefs, and responses) which do fit and which are reinforced [pp. 275-276].

A major short-coming of most theories is that they do not deal adequately with the phenomenology of the participant (Lieberman et al., 1969). Schein and Bennis (1965) touch on this area when they attempt to account for some of the factors producing participant discomfort at the beginning of the laboratory or in its early sessions:

> Tensions have different sources: (1) dilemmas created by the unfreezing forces—how to establish a viable identity in the group, how to control others, how to insure that the group goals will include his own needs, and how to keep the group discussion at an appropriate level of intimacy; (2) the heightened consciousness of self that brings with it the possibility of discovering something within himself that will prove to be unacceptable; (3) the actual possibility of getting honest reactions to himself from others, which have always been relatively unavailable and may prove to reveal unacceptable parts

> of himself, or worse, may prove himself to be entirely unacceptable; (4) defensive reactions to feedback already obtained, either because it was hostile and retaliatory or because it was too threatening; (5) the belief or assumption that he may not be able to change behavior which is unacceptable to others (therefore it may be better not to learn about it in the first place); (6) the belief or assumption that feedback is always evaluative and always deals with inadequacies or things that are wrong [p. 301].

The initial tension soon dissipates as participants have opportunities to test assumptions, apprehensions, and fantasies against the reality that they observe. Different sets of tensions replace some of the initial ones; the latter seem to be associated with intercurrent events in the group, stages of self-discovery, and the vicissitudes of various interpersonal relationships.

Some questions that are frequently raised:

How are T-Groups opened? The laboratory typically opens in a general session in which, among other things, the broad objectives are stated, staff are introduced, group rosters are distributed, etc. This may or may not be followed by some warm-up activity.

The first few minutes of the first T-group session requires some statement from the trainer regarding himself and the group. The statement is usually quite brief and is usually distorted by participants as a result of their state of tension. Opening trainer statements vary according to the values of the trainer, the nature of the laboratory (emphasis), and the sense of urgency that the trainer feels in helping to establish certain norms. A few examples follow:

> This group will meet for many hours and will serve as a kind of laboratory where each individual can increase his understanding of the forces which influence individual behavior and the performance of groups and organizations. The data for learning will be our own behavior, feelings, and reactions. We begin with no definite structure or organization, no agreed-upon procedures, and no specific agenda. It will be up to us to fill the vacuum created by the lack of these familiar elements and to study our group as we evolve. My role will be to help the group to learn from its own experience, but not to act as a traditional chairman nor to suggest how we should organize, what our procedure should be, or exactly what our agenda will include. With these few comments, I think we are ready to begin in whatever

way you feel will be most helpful [NTL Institute News and Reports, 1969a].

This opening would seem appropriate for several types of laboratories (Basic Human Interaction Laboratories, Group Emphasis Laboratories, Organization Development Laboratories).

In laboratories which emphasize personal-interpersonal learning, the following T-group opening might be appropriate:

> We will meet together in this group for a number of sessions in order to deepen our understanding of who each of us is and how we relate to each other. In order to accomplish this, we will need, as much as possible, to try to communicate openly with each other and share our reactions, feelings, and perceptions. I see my role as that of a facilitator rather than the usual leader. From time to time, I might suggest an activity that I think would be helpful, but it is important to remember that it is only a suggestion—as anyone else can make at any time in here. Now we need to find a way to begin.

If the laboratory has an emphasis such as "Laboratory in Conflict Resolution," and if the trainer is concerned that the T-group achieve an organic integrity with the rest of the laboratory, he might mention in his opening statement that the T-group, in addition to other possibilities, can provide opportunities for each person to learn directly from the T-group experience about conflict resolution. On the other hand, he might think that it would be wiser to omit the statement and, instead, give special attention to that class of phenomena as it occurs.

Trainers vary as to how much value they place on the initial floundering of the group after the opening statement. Most agree that it is important for the group to experience the fact that they have developed a great deal of dependence upon familiar structural properties of groups (designated leader, agenda, etc.). Some feel the need to assist the group in beginning to establish the experiential "here and now" norm. In this case, the trainer might say something along the line of:

> We can talk about anything we want to in here. But the more we keep our discussions within the group—our feelings, reactions, what's going on here, among us—the more will we be using this situation for our learning.

Regardless of the form that the opening takes, subsequent trainer interventions can be seen as influencing the development of group norms. Psathas and Hardert (1966) present some interesting data on trainer interventions and normative patterns in seven T-groups. They found that trainer interventions having to do with ". . . norms pertaining to the categories of Analyzing Group Interaction or Process, Feelings, Feedback, and Acceptance Concern . . . are the most frequent (in this order)" (pp. 165-166).

Later, they speculate:

> One norm-category may show a high frequency because establishing this behavior is a necessary prerequisite for later group development. Another norm-category may show its highest frequency only when conditions are so favorable that an intervention can have its greatest impact and the norm is most likely to develop. The occurrence of a critical incident in the group could also serve to crystallize an operating norm to which the trainer may later have to labor to direct the group's attention. His interventions can be concerned with directing the group to reexamine its procedures and revise its operating norm, particularly if these are not compatible or consistent with other norms he seeks to develop [p. 167].

How are participants selected? Selection is not a suitable concept for describing the process by which participants are admitted to laboratories. Descriptive materials about the laboratories are widely distributed and applications from individuals are accepted. For laboratories oriented toward specific occupations and levels within organizations, applicants must meet the stated criteria.

In NTL Institute programs, however, emphasis has recently increased in regard to being explicit with applicants about the purpose and nature of programs. Policy is defined in the manual on "Standards for the Use of Laboratory Method in NTL Institute Programs" (1969) in the following excerpts:

> . . . Institute programs should be directed to the specific purposes and needs of the client group as they are agreed upon by consultant and client. They should be designed to include only those processes and techniques appropriate to the agreed-upon purposes and needs [1969, p. 6].
>
> Insofar as it is possible to distinguish between education and psychotherapy, NTL Institute programs are applied for educational,

not psychotherapeutic, purposes. The Institute does not design or conduct programs to cure or alleviate pathological, mental, or emotional conditions [1969, p. 7].

1. Programs using laboratory method are deemed appropriate for persons of any age, occupation, or educational level, provided they are designed and conducted in keeping with the standards presented in this paper.
2. A person undergoing psychotherapy or intensive counseling should consult his therapist before enrolling in a laboratory training program.
3. Persons in the following categories should not ordinarily participate in a laboratory training program:

> Those whose participation is based primarily on the wishes or demands of another, e.g., an employer, rather than on any degree of personal motivation.
>
> Those whose goal in participating would be to cure or alleviate a severe mental or emotional disturbance.
>
> Those with a significant history of incapacitating response to interpersonal stress.
>
> To the limited extent that personal difficulties are predictable and screening procedures make it possible, prospective participants should be screened for these conditions [1969, p. 9].

The policy is operationalized in printed materials announcing programs. The brochure announcing the 1970 NTL Institute programs points out, for example, that "NTL Institute Programs are not designed or intended as psychotherapy or as a substitute for psychotherapy. Nor are the training laboratories to be construed as professional preparation for conducting laboratory training." A typical brochure statement might say, "These programs are intended to assist successful, normally functioning persons to further increase their effectiveness in understanding and working with others."

As the considerable amount of research being conducted on laboratory training progresses, it may be possible to spell out more definitively some of the screening criteria. Argyris (1964) has discussed some issues to be taken into account when evaluating potential participants:

> People who learn in T-groups seem to possess at least three attributes:
>
> 1. A relatively strong ego. . . .
> 2. Defenses which are sufficiently low to allow the individual to

> hear what others say to him (accurately and with minimal threat to himself), without the aid of a professional scanning and filtering system (that is, the therapist, the educator).
>
> 3. The ability to communicate thoughts and feelings with minimal distortion.
>
> . . . [Those who profit from training laboratory are] . . . relatively healthy individuals capable of learning from others how to enhance their degree of effectiveness . . . [p. 67].

No one should be encouraged to attend a laboratory as an act of administrative discipline, e.g., "to get him straightened out." Organizations which have a program of routinely supporting laboratory attendance for people at certain levels should make every effort to insure that attendance is voluntary. One method might be to have several optional development programs available to the individual, including laboratory training.

Undoubtedly, the issue of who should or should not attend training laboratories needs additional consideration.

Trainer Development and Certification

In the early stages, those who took trainer roles in NTL programs transferred their skills from fields such as adult education, group dynamics, and clinical psychology. But as the popularity of the approach increased and additional resource persons were needed, it became necessary to conceptualize the trainer role more objectively and to develop training programs for trainers. Benne (Bradford et al., 1964, pp. 110-113) recalls that during the first ten years of its operation NTL depended primarily upon an apprenticeship system to train new trainers. The usual model was for persons holding doctorates in one of the social sciences to attend a laboratory as a participant and then to act as co-trainer in a number of programs before assuming full responsibility for a group. Later several "training of trainer" programs were held for laboratory alumni and other specialized groups.

The first formalized internship program was held in Bethel during the summer of 1960. It combined participation in a laboratory, co-training experience, and seminars on the various theoretical and methodological issues relevant to training. Subsequent intern programs have followed the same general format. Emphasis is placed upon competence in personal and interpersonal understanding and interaction, as well as mastery of

cognitive material. Currently, NTL conducts internships in Applied Behavioral Science and in Group Leadership primarily for behavioral scientists interested in becoming professional trainers. In addition, there are a variety of programs in organization development, planned change, educational consultation, and community change intended for persons who plan to occupy training and consulting roles within their own organizational settings.

A number of university graduate programs have also provided training techniques and related skills, either as a part of doctoral programs in social science fields or as an elective minor focus. Some of the schools that have, at varying times, provided trained personnel to the laboratory training field include Boston University, M.I.T., University of Michigan, UCLA, University of Cincinnati, Case Western Reserve University, and University of Kansas.

Throughout the history of laboratory training there has been continuing concern with the problem of standards for qualifications and conduct of trainers. NTL has never accredited trainers in a formal sense. Professionals elected as Associates or Fellows in the NTL Institute have usually completed one of the internship programs and thus have been screened at several stages. However, admission to associateship or fellowship status means that the individual has entered the resource pool from which staffs for NTL labs and other programs will be drawn, not that he has been certified. This condition, however, is often misunderstood, and membership in NTL is sought by many individuals who wish to enhance their professional legitimacy in the training field. There is, in this sense, "de facto" certification being carried on.

As one step toward clarification of the criteria for trainer qualification the NTL Institute has recently ratified by Board action and published a statement entitled "Standards for the Use of the Laboratory Method in NTL Institute Programs" (1969). One section deals with standards for trainers and consultants *who represent the NTL Institute and/or hold staff roles in NTL programs.*

Standards for Trainers and Consultants

1. NTL Institute endorses the *Ethical Standards of Psychologists* of the American Psychological Association and urges its members to guide their conduct accordingly.

2. In relationships with individual clients and client groups, persons representing NTL Institute are expected to discuss candidly and fully goals, risks, limitations, and anticipated outcomes of any program under consideration.

3. NTL Institute trainers and consultants are expected to endorse the purposes and values and adhere to the standards presented in this paper.

4. NTL Institute trainers and consultants are expected to have mastered the following skills:

Ability to conduct a small group and to provide individual consultation using the theory and techniques of laboratory method.

Ability to articulate theory and to direct a variety of learning experiences for small and large groups and for organizations.

Ability to recognize their own behavior styles and personal needs and to deal with them productively in the performance of their professional roles.

Ability to recognize symptoms of serious psychological stress and to make responsible decisions when such problems arise.

5. NTL Institute trainers and consultants are expected to have a strong theoretical foundation. This ordinarily implies graduate work in a behavioral science discipline or equivalent experience in the field.

6. NTL Institute trainers and consultants are expected to complete the following training experiences:

Participation in at least one NTL Institute basic Human Relations laboratory.

Supervised co-training with senior staff members.

Participation on laboratory staff with experienced trainers in programs for a variety of client groups.

Participation in an NTL Institute or university program specifically designed to train trainers.

[This sequence of activities usually requires a minimum of two years to complete].

7. NTL Institute trainers and consultants are expected to continually evaluate their own work, to seek individual growth experiences, and to contribute to the evaluation and development of the art and science of training and consultation.

NOTE: Basic human relations laboratories, executive development programs, and similar beginning-level programs are designed to help participants be more effective in personal and job roles, not to be-

come trainers. No capabilities as a T-group trainer or consultant should be assumed as a result of participation in one or more basic laboratories or other short-term experiences [pp. 10-12].

Stress in Laboratory Training. Currently, there is a great deal of concern being raised by various persons concerning actual or potential psychological injury associated with laboratory training. Some of this concern seems to be genuinely motivated in terms of a wish to protect the public welfare, while the motivation in other instances, because of its "shotgun" approach, seems questionable.

One concern that has been mentioned is that laboratory training, in general, produces a pathologically high level of stress. What is the evidence? The only data on this subject as yet available comes from the study by Lubin and Zuckerman (1969). The most stressful level in four T-groups of an NTL Institute laboratory with a group emphasis was compared with the stress conditions in a six-hour, an eight-hour, and a twenty-four hour perceptual isolation experiment. The Multiple Affect Adjective Check List (Zuckerman and Lubin, 1965), a self-report instrument that measures anxiety, depression, and hostility, was used in the stress and nonstress conditions of the perceptual isolation studies; in the laboratory it was administered before the conference began and at the end of each T-group session. The most stressful session in the four T-groups was significantly lower on all three scales than the three perceptual isolation conditions.

When raw scores were converted to T scores according to the instrument's standardization sample, in the four T-groups no individual achieved a T score of 70 (psychometrically deviant), while each of the three perceptual isolation studies produced some T scores at that level (32%, 24%, and 31%).

Using this as a start, we are collecting data in other life situations said to be stressful for comparison purposes. Preliminary analysis seems to indicate, for example, that T-group stress (highest point of emotional arousal) is of the order of that experienced by college students just prior to an examination.

NTL Institute records indicate that of 14,200 participants in its summer and industrial programs between 1947 and 1968, for 33 (.2%) the experience was stressful enough to require them to leave the

program prior to its completion [NTL Institute News and Reports, 1969b].

The only other published figures are those from an intensive program of laboratory training in the YMCA:

> A systematic effort was made to track down each instance of allegedly severe negative experience in YMCA sensitivity training for professional staff. Out of the approximately 1,200 participants, four negative experience cases were finally identified [.3%]. Even for these four cases, however, the experience as a whole was not completely negative. Data gathered from careful interviews with the principals themselves, their work supervisors, their sensitivity group trainers, other group participants, and, where applicable, with clinicians working with the principals, indicate that for three out of four persons thus involved the disruptive experience actually turned out to be helpful and is now appraised by them as being a valuable learning experience which has enhanced their effectiveness as individuals and as YMCA Directors. In the fourth case, although the individual does not evaluate the experience as being a positive one for him, he has not been incapacitated by the experience and is continuing to do an effective job in his position as a YMCA Director [Batchelder and Hardy, 1968, pp. 83-84].

Jaffe and Scherl (1969) report on two cases of acute psychosis resulting from small-group activity. Although the title of the article contains the term T-group, the text refers in one case to a weekend experience which, by description, would seem to be more of an encounter group than a T-group. The other situation, two weeks in length, was a leadership training experience "required by his company." Both situations are a bit unusual in the size of the reported T-groups (15 and 19).

Several branch societies of the American Psychiatric Association have requested their membership to report to a central register all casualties from the various kinds of small groups. We believe this to be a potentially useful activity, but unless data are collected systematically and in relevant detail, it is likely to produce more confusion than illumination. To tabulate the number of casualties from unspecified or improperly specified small groups would be similar to a statement about the number of people who had adverse reactions to "medications." We need to know about participant characteristics, the kind of small group, if possible the type

of activity that seemed to precipitate the distress, the qualifications of the leader, etc. Such documentation would be important.[5]

Recognizing the fact that participants sometimes have medical needs while away from home, the NTL Institute over the past few years has been making available inresidence medical consultation in summer laboratories.

Laboratory Training in Comparison with Group Psychotherapy and Encounter Groups. In the opening section of this paper, a brief description of the components of a laboratory design was presented. Important for comparison purposes at this point is the fact that there is more than one T-group in the laboratory model, multiple groupings are used, multilevel learnings (personal, interpersonal, and, in some laboratories, group and organizational) are sought, prior staff planning attempts to match client learning needs with a range of group technologies, conceptualization of experience is encouraged, and opportunity for integration and discussion of transfer of learning to back-home situations is provided. Also, laboratory training is defined as an educational rather than a therapeutic procedure.

Laboratory Training Groups and Group Psychotherapy. Despite increasing variation in the practice of group psychotherapy (see Gottschalk and Pattison, 1969) the adult outpatient group seen in psychiatric clinics or community mental health centers still represents the mode and can be used as a point of comparison.

Scheidlinger (1967) described group psychotherapy as:

> . . . a psychosocial process wherein a trained practitioner (usually psychiatrist, psychologist, or social worker) utilizes the emotional interaction produced in small, carefully planned groups to effect 'repair' of personality malformation in individuals specifically selected for this purpose.
>
> Since group psychotherapy has, with very few exceptions, evolved from the general field of psychotherapy, its concepts and techniques naturally reflect this fact. There is, thus, first of all, a primary emphasis on curing individual mental ill health [p. 54].

It was this type of group that Frank (1964) had in mind when he made comparisons between it and the T-group with a group emphasis.

[5] The NTL Institute is currently conducting a national survey of training procedures and materials in order to evaluate their major values and limitations.

Similarities that he found were: both emphasize the importance of accurate communication, both attempt to assist members to change attitude and behavior, responsible functioning of members is valued in both, early sessions in both are characterized by uncertainty about the group's purpose and lack of trust in the method used, early sessions in both reveal more than moderate tension in members, and "in both . . . the most useful meetings seem to be those in which there is an issue or 'focal conflict,' which is of interest to most or all of the members, and arouses their emotions . . . . Moreover, some of these issues are the same in both groups—such as conflict over dependence on versus rebellion against authority and between desire for and fear of closeness to peers" (p. 447).

Some of the differences between group psychotherapy and the group emphasis T-group as seen by Frank are: therapy group members are seen by themselves and others as having psychological problems and needing help, whereas T-group members are seen as relatively well-functioning individuals interested in improving old skills and learning new ones; attitudes which therapy attempts to modify are usually concerned with persons who are close to the patient and therefore more central and resistant to change, whereas the T-group attempts to modify more peripheral attitudes; the therapist is a much more central person than the trainer and dependency upon him continues to be strong throughout; and the T-group, focusing less upon the individual, evokes more moderate emotional responses.

To this list of differences can be added the fact that the group emphasis T-group deals almost exclusively with the "here and now" of group development and transactions among members, to the exclusion of genetic material. The therapy group, on the other hand, frequently searches for the factors associated with conflicts and perceptual distortions in the patient's past life experiences. Dreams, fantasy and discussion of patients' relationships with people not in the group are very legitimate for the work of the therapy group. The patient in group therapy is not interested in and does not attend in order to learn about "groups." For him the therapy group mainly exists as the medium through which the amelioration of his suffering or help with personal problems takes place. Conversely, the group emphasis T-group member has a high investment in learning about groups and improving his leadership and membership skills.

In the T-group which has a personal-interpersonal emphasis, one again finds members defined as relatively well-functioning people. They are primarily concerned with learning about themselves in interaction with others, and less concerned with group level learning. By definition, this type of T-group will deal with attitudes that are more central to members, e.g., life style and values. The personal-interpersonal T-group may include encountering methods, other nonverbal techniques, role play, the use of fantasy, etc., in addition to verbal discussion. The position of the trainer seems to be more central in the personal-interpersonal T-group than in the group emphasis T-group.

Laboratory Training Groups and Encounter Groups. Published accounts of encounter groups are largely anecdotal and/or autobiographical and do not contain a clear statement of theory or method. Encounter groups differ very much among themselves, partly because of the very central role of the leader. The uniqueness of his personal style and his inventiveness are highly prized and very influential. Otto and Mann (1968) have put together a series of articles, all within the domain of the encounter group movement. The title of the book, *Ways of Growth: Approaches to Expanding Awareness,* appropriately indicates the individualistic, currently nongeneralizable nature of the field. As Burton (1969) observes, "Encounter groups have been so busy being expressive that they have had little time to look to their theories" (p. ix).

Despite the many differences in approach of the various encounter groups, most of them have emerged from the existentialist and humanistic tradition and some of them have been heavily influenced by Eastern philosophy. Martin Buber, Viktor Frankl, Wilhelm Reich, and Fritz Perls are some of the progenitors frequently mentioned as sources of ideas and methods.

Encounter[6] group practitioners believe that man functions at a small fraction of his potential and that methods which remove blockages and release this potential enable him to integrate at substantially higher levels of functioning. The encounter has been defined as ". . . a sudden, spontaneous, intuitive meeting with another person in which there is

[6] For purposes of this paper, we consider the marathon group as an extended encounter group, for several of its features (therapeutic change goals, intensity, centrality of the leader, methods that circumvent the defenses, etc.) are similar to those of the encounter group.

an immediate sense of relatedness . . ." (Moustakas, 1967, p. 45). Perls et al. (1951) use this notion in a broader sense to include clear communication and contact between parts of the self. Such strategies as increasing sensory awareness, relaxation methods, fantasy and dream study, nonverbal games, physical contact, meditation, etc., are utilized to circumvent the restrictions maintained by the censoring ego, to enable participants to get in contact with early "feeling memories," to experience feelings at deeper levels, and to make the unconscious conscious. Encounter groups vary from those which emphasize somatopsychologic methods (Schutz, 1967) to those that are mainly verbal (Rogers, 1967). The group exists as the environment in which these activities take place. The group, however, is *not* the object of study.

The centrality of the encounter group leader and his prerogative to structure the experience of participants are accepted by participants. In contrast, participants in laboratory training are encouraged to examine their feelings about and their perceptions of the various roles that the trainer takes during the laboratory as part of the learning process.

The nature and timing of the feedback model utilized in the different types of groups seems to be another important factor. The study by Psathas and Hardert (1966) found that in the group emphasis T-group, trainer interventions regarding feedback were third in frequency among the norm categories throughout the lab and second in frequency during the middle of the lab. This confirms our impression that personal feedback is reinforced relatively later in the group emphasis T-group. Personal feedback is legitimized and reinforced early in the personal-interpersonal T-group.

In the encounter group, since the role of the leader is so central to what takes place in the group, the occurrence of feedback from peers is variable and depends upon the leader's style. In the gestalt encounter group, for example, the leader may work in a one-to-one manner with an individual for an extended period of time. It might be quite awhile before other group members have the opportunity to share impressions and feelings with the protagonist.

To recapitulate, laboratory training (including both the T-group with a group emphasis and the T-group with a personal-interpersonal emphasis) retains a strong tie to its origin as an educational method, is concerned with cognitive as well as affective learning, and values the

ability of the participant to transfer learnings to the back-home situation. It differs from group psychotherapy (the form practiced in many adult outpatient clinics) in that lab participants are seen as relatively well-functioning individuals, repair and restoration of function are not among its objectives, the leader is less central to the process, and the perspective is upon current group developments and interpersonal transactions.

The T-group with a personal-interpersonal emphasis resembles some encounter groups in some of the methods that are used, but it deals less with personal-historical material and has more of an educational focus. Psychotherapists sometimes refer patients to encounter groups as a means of breaking through impasses and inhibitions, but the NTL Institute does not encourage attendance by this group of clients in its programs.

Encounter groups resemble therapy groups in the depth of participant change that is sought and in the centrality of the leader to the process.

The forthcoming report of the Task Force on Recent Developments in the Use of Small Groups of the American Psychiatric Association (*Encounter Groups and Psychiatry,* in press) notes an important point of contrast among T-groups, therapy groups, and encounter groups: "T-groups, springing from the field of social psychology, have behind them a long tradition of research in group dynamics. No comparable body of knowledge has been generated by group therapy, a field notoriously deficient in any systematic research. Thus, what is presently known of the basic science of group psychotherapy stems almost entirely from social-psychological research with task groups and T-groups; psychotherapy owes to the T-group much of its systematic understanding of such factors as group development, group pressure, group cohesiveness, leadership, and group norms and values. Furthermore, T-group research has elaborated a wealth of sophisticated research techniques and tools of which the group therapy field is now slowly availing itself. . . . the variegated new forms of the encounter group are, of course, even less research-oriented than the group psychotherapy field" (p. 23).

Unlike NTL Institute laboratory training programs and group psychotherapy conducted by members of the American Group Psychotherapy Association, encounter group practitioners do not have a national organization which defines standards of practice and concerns itself with accreditation or certification. Many encounter group leaders are doctoral

level professional people who conduct their activities in a manner that would be acceptable to various professional societies. On the other hand, the fact that there are no national standards is a matter of concern, for it permits anyone to conduct encounter groups. Moreover, encountering techniques, similar to hypnotic induction techniques, are powerful instruments and are simple to learn. There is no indication that leaders of encounter groups caution group members about potential hazards in the use of these techniques nor are distinctions made between client experience and experience designed for the development of encounter group leaders.

The call for a comparative analysis of the full range of groups concerned with "promoting personal growth, behavior modification, or development" issued by Lieberman, Lakin, and Whitaker (1969) is one with which we very much concur. This seems to be the most promising possibility for increasing our knowledge of process and outcome and of freeing practitioners of various persuasions from the bondage of their own rhetoric.

SOME THOUGHTS FOR THE FUTURE

Some of the readers of this *Journal* are probably interested in the more clinical aspects of laboratory training. Increasingly, the method is being used, for example, in training programs for group psychotherapists in order to provide trainees with information about how their behavior is perceived by others and to enable them to experience the effects of various group phenomena. However, the future of laboratory training will be concerned with broader issues. Predictable developments can be seen in the areas of system change, organizational development, temporary systems, social issues, and the new university.

System Change

Society's institutions are growing increasingly complex, more impersonal, and sometimes less relevant to human needs. Behavioral scientists are focusing upon complex systems and have begun to develop conceptual schemes and technologies intended to bring about constructive change. The late psychologist, Douglas McGregor, wrote a management classic entitled *The Human Side of Enterprise* (1960) in which he related

Maslow's theory of human motivation (1954) to the relationship between the employee and his organization. Since that time there has been a progression of experiments in applying laboratory training and its allied technologies to the changing of systems. Increasing interest is developing in these conceptualizations and technologies.

One major approach has involved using laboratory training for managers of organizations. The assumption has been that managers who are more sensitive to the needs and feelings of peers and subordinates, more aware of their own styles, and more perceptive about the workings of social systems can build organizations which are both more humane and more productive.

The focus of change and development has begun to shift more directly from the individual to the social system within which he functions. There is growing consensus that re-education and behavior change are unlikely to endure unless the back-home environment supports and reinforces the new behavior and encourages continuing development. Thus, approaches that deal with changing the operations and norms of systems are being explored. It has become clearer in recent years, for example, that laboratory training must be conducted at top management levels where the organizational influence is greatest. There is every reason to believe that NTL Institute programs for presidents, key executives, and high-level managers of organizations are likely to expand.

At the level of community, the orientation is toward establishing community problem-solving and decision-making processes which will facilitate the development of a "more mentally healthy society."

There is evidence that a large proportion of the responses elicited from citizens to their "problems in living" involve indigenous resources outside the professional mental health ranks. The total community can usefully be viewed as a system of resources for dealing with a variety of human problems, including, but not limited to, those defined as "mental health" problems (Eddy et al., 1970).

Klein (1968) asserts that, "The community cannot remain only the setting in which mental health agencies operate; instead, it must become the essential source of mental health itself." He advocates the use of community development approaches, techniques of education (including laboratory methods), and strategies of social intervention as tools of

change. He describes a variety of concepts and methods for instituting community development and change processes. These deal with such issues as building interorganizational collaboration, managing conflict, increasing citizen participation, and developing more viable approaches to understanding and solving problems.

Programs for individuals who can act as "change agents" in a variety of settings are increasing, and are likely to continue to do so. In addition to general programs in planned change, the NTL Institute and its affiliated organizations offer professional development programs in such areas as educational, community, and industrial change. A vocational role as "professional change facilitator" is emerging, and a clearer definition of this role will be available.

Organizational Development

Paralleling the focus upon system change, the emphasis upon organization development (OD) during the next decade undoubtedly will greatly expand. OD combines the theory and technology of laboratory training with the methodologies of organizational change and management education. Objectives of an OD project are:

1. To create an open, problem-solving climate throughout the organization.
2. To supplement the authority associated with role or status with the authority of knowledge and competence.
3. To locate decision-making and problem-solving responsibilities as close to the information sources as possible.
4. To build trust among individuals and groups throughout the organization.
5. To make competition more relevant to work goals and to maximize collaborative efforts.
6. To develop a reward system which recognizes both the achievement of the organization's mission (profits or service) and organization development (growth of people).
7. To increase the sense of "ownership" of organization objectives throughout the work force.
8. To help managers to manage according to relevant objectives rather than according to "past practices" or according to objectives which do not make sense for one's area of responsibility.
9. To increase self-control and self-direction for people within the organization [NTL Institute News and Reports, 1968, p. 1].

In the next decade, laboratory training methods will be applied with increasing sophistication (Davis, 1967) toward the basic aim of helping organizations more effectively use their own resources for organization renewal and problem solving.

Temporary Systems

Work and social relations are increasingly being carried out within the framework of temporary structures: committees, project teams, task forces, conferences, consulting relationships, etc. (Miles, 1964; Bennis and Slater, 1968). These temporary systems in communities and organizations frequently bring together persons with differing skills, roles, and backgrounds to pool their resources for more effective problem solving. If the attitudes, goals, and styles of the members happen to mesh in the right way, the group may be productive. If not, much potential is lost and disappointment in group work occurs. Often the problem is too important to justify leaving the development of teamwork to chance.

There are a variety of implications of temporary systems for organizations, but an issue directly related to laboratory training is that the skills of effective membership are frequently lacking. Individuals need to know how to move quickly into team relationships in which mutual trust, collaboration, and communication support satisfying and productive operations. The laboratory is, itself, a temporary system, and the analysis of the development of the laboratory and its small groups provides the participant the opportunity to learn more about the functioning of temporary systems. It allows him to examine his own behavior and feelings in such situations and the impact of these upon the functioning of the group. Organizations which are finding temporary systems an increasingly important aspect of their operation are relying on laboratory training or its variants (such as managerial grid training [Blake and Mouton, 1964]) to help their members develop skills and perspectives to operate effectively in team situations.

Social Issues

In addition to a general focus on system change, many behavioral scientists are committed to working on specific social problems through their research and action skills. Recent issues of the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* a publication of the NTL Institute, have carried

articles on such topics as helping teachers improve classroom group processes (Schmuck, 1968); consultation with a civil rights organization on its internal problems (Nadler, 1968); cross-cultural training for the Peace Corps (Harrison and Hopkins, 1967); planning behavior change in juvenile offenders (Lenrow, 1966); reinforcement of police neutrality in civil rights confrontations (Shellow, 1965); the reduction of prejudice (Rubin, 1967). Another important social application of the laboratory method is in the training of administrators and professional staff of comprehensive community mental health centers (Dupre and Lubin, 1970).

The variety and number of social problems to which laboratory training will be applied will continue to expand.

The New University for the Applied Behavioral Sciences

These challenges and the many more that will arise during the coming decade have led logically to the creation of a degree-granting educational institution which will train applied behavioral scientists to add to the more than 500 members of the NTL Institute network.

The formation of The New University for the Applied Behavioral Sciences, which will be located in the Washington, D.C., area, has been announced by the NTL Institute. Major organizational units of the university are: The NTL Institute, the College of Applied Behavioral Science, and the Institute for a Voluntary Society.

According to Leland P. Bradford, Executive Director, the purposes of the university will be: (1) To train postdoctoral scientists in the theory, processes, and skills of the application of behavioral science knowledge and method to practical problems, (2) to train paraprofessionals who are leaders on many levels and in many areas of the social scene as change agents, competent at their level to encourage and maintain necessary adjustments in their organizations, (3) to expand the theory, research, and model development of processes of change, (4) to develop collaborative "think tanks" consisting of scholars, researchers, and leading practitioners in order to facilitate the linkage necessary for change to take place, and (5) to continue to provide programs which will encourage social and organizational growth and development.

Applied behavioral scientists must come out of their university laboratories and use their knowledge to help society bring about the changes that must come if the many pressing problems are to be resolved.

The new university seeks to develop scientists who are not only willing to come out of the laboratory but who know how to use their knowledge and skills to deal effectively with real social and organizational problems (Bradford, 1970).

REFERENCES

Argyris, C. (1964), T-Groups for Organizational Effectiveness. *Harvard Bus. Rev.*, 42:60-74.

——— (1968), Conditions for Competence Acquisition and Therapy, *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 4:147-177.

Batchelder, R. L., and Hardy, J. M. (1968), *Using Sensitivity Training and the Laboratory Method: An Organizational Case Study in the Development of Human Resources.* New York: Association Press.

Benne, K. D. (1964), History of the T-Group in the Laboratory Setting, In: *T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method,* ed. L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb, and K. D. Benne. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 80-135.

Bennis, W. G., and Shepard, H. A. (1956), A Theory of Group Development *Hum. Relat.*, 9:415-437.

———, and Slater, P. E. (1968), *The Temporary Society.* New York: Harper & Row.

Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S. (1964), *The Managerial Grid.* Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.

Bradford, L. P. (1967), Biography of an Institution. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 3:127-143.

——— (1970), Personal communication.

——— et al. (eds.) (1954), *T-Group Theory and Laboratory Methods: Innovation in Re-Education.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bunker, D. R. (1965), Individual Applications of Laboratory Training. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 1:131-148.

Burton, A. (ed.) (1969), *Encounter: The Theory and Practice of Encounter Groups.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, S. A. (1967), An Organic Problem-Solving Method of Organizational Change. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 3:3-21.

Diederich, P. B., and Van Til, W. (1945), *The Workshop: A Summary of Principles and Practices of the Workshop Movement.* New York: Hinds, Hayden & Eldridge.

Dupre, V. A., and Lubin, A. W. (1970), *A Community Mental Health Workshop-Laboratory: A Report on the Experiential Sequences.* Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute.

Eddy, W. B., Glad, D. D. and Dupre, V. A. (1968), The Midwestern Laboratory for Executive Development. *Hum. Rel. Train. News,* 12, No. 3:3-5.

———, Paap, S. M. and Glad, D. D. (1970), Solving Problems in Living: The Citizen's Viewpoint. *Ment. Hyg.*, 4:64-72.

Frank, J. D. (1964), Training and Therapy. In: *T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method,* ed. L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb, and K. D. Benne. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 442-451.

Gottschalk, L. A., and Pattison, M. (1969), Psychiatric Perspectives on T-Groups and the Laboratory Movement: An Overview. *Amer. J. Psychiat.*, 126:823-839.

Hampden-Turner, C. M. (1966), An Existential "Learning Theory" and the Integration of T-Group Research. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 2:367-386.

Harrison, R. L., and Hopkins, R. L. (1967), The Design of Cross-Cultural Training: An Alternative to the University Model. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 3:431-460.

Jaffe, S. L., and Scherl, D. J. (1969), Acute Psychosis Precipitated by T-Group Experiences. *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.*, 21:443-448.

Klein, D. C. (1968), *Community Dynamics and Mental Health*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lenrow, P. B. (1966), A Framework for Planning Behavior Change in Juvenile Offenders. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 3:287-303.

Lieberman, M. A., Lakin, M., and Whitaker, D. S. (1969), Problems and Potential of Psychoanalytic and Group-Dynamic Theories for Group Psychotherapy. *This Journal*, 19:131-141.

Lubin, B., and Zuckerman, M. (1969), Level of Emotional Arousal in Laboratory Training. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 5:483-490.

Mann, R. D. (1967), *Interpersonal Styles and Group Development*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Maslow, A. H. (1954), *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Bros.

McGregor, D. (1960), *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miles, M. B. (1964), On Temporary Systems. In: *Innovation in Education*, ed. M. B. Miles. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Moustakas, C. (1967), *Creativity and Conformity*. Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand.

NTL Institute News and Reports (1968), 2, No. 3:1-2. (Developed by Jack Fordyce and W. Warner Burke).

——— (1969a), 2, No. 2:1-2. (Taken from a paper written by Charles Seashore for the Mid-Career Education Project, Wayne State University, Department of Political Science, April, 1969.)

——— (1969b), 3, No. 4:1.

Nadler, E. B. (1968), Social Therapy of a Civil Rights Organization. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 4:281-298.

Otto, H. A., and Mann, J. (eds.) (1968), *Ways of Growth: Approaches to Expanding Awareness*. New York: Grossman Publishers.

Perls, F., Hefferline, R., and Goodman, P. (1951), *Gestalt Therapy*. New York: Julian Press.

Psathas, G., and Hardert, R. (1966), Trainer Interventions and Normative Patterns in the T-Group. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 2:149-169.

Rogers, C. R. (1967), The Process of the Basic Encounter Group. In: *Challenges of Humanistic Psychology*, ed. J. F. T. Bugental. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rubin, I. (1967), The Reduction of Prejudice Through Laboratory Training. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 3:29-50.

Scheidlinger, S. (1967), Current Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Group Psychotherapy Research: Introduction to Panel-Part I. *This Journal*, 17:53-56.

Schein, E. H., and Bennis, W. G. (1965), *Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Schmuck, R. A. (1968), Helping Teachers Improve Classroom Group Processes. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 4:401-435.

Schutz, W. C. (1967), *Joy: Expanding Human Awareness*. New York: Grove Press.

Shellow, R. (1965), Reinforcing Police Neutrality in Civil Rights Confrontations. *J. Appl. Beh. Sci.*, 3:243-254.

Standards for the Use of the Laboratory Method in NTL Institute Programs (1969), Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute.

Weschler, I. R., Massarik, F., and Tannenbaum, R. (1962), The Self in Process: A Sensitivity Training Emphasis. In: *Issues in Human Relations Training*, Vol. 5 of National Training Laboratories Selected Reading Series ed. I. R. Weschler. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, pp. 33-46.

Zuckerman, M., and Lubin, B. (1965), *Multiple Affect Adjective Check List: Manual.* San Diego, California: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.

Dr. Lubin's address:
School of Medicine
University of Missouri
600 East 22nd Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64108